DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 141 CS 504 892

AUTHOR Cocetti, Robert A.
TITLE Communication Style or Leadership: The Validation and Interpretation of an Instrument.
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association (Indianapolis, IN, April 4-6, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Communication; *Communication Research; Educational Theories; Factor Analysis; Interpersonal Relationship; *Leadership Styles; *Measurement Techniques; Speech Communication; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Effectiveness; Test Construction; *Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS *Communicator Style

ABSTRACT

The instrument designed by Patricia Kearney to measure communication style was chosen for a study of validity and reliability for three reasons: (1) the format of the instrument appeared to be more descriptive than evaluative, (2) its theoretical foundations encouraged the viewpoint that there is no one best communication style, and (3) it was designed as a peer report. After being administered to four separate student populations and analyzed through the methods of factor analysis and regression analysis, the instrument was revised to reflect small group leadership theory. The final composite picture described by the instrument is that a successful teacher is one who is not rigid and who is high in responsiveness, general interpersonal skills or consideration, and assertiveness of initiating structure. In terms of small group leadership theory, such an interpretation of the instrument considers leadership to be a more useful metaphor for teaching than communication style. In addition, leadership stresses the interaction between leader and follower, a concept not strongly stressed in communication style research. (A copy of the instrument is appended.) (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257141

Communication Style or Leadership: The Validation and Interpretation of an Instrument.

Robert A. Cocetti

Kearney State College

Department of Speech Communication

Kearney, Nebraska 68849-0526

308 234-8406

This study begins with Kearney's Teacher Communication Style, and using four separate student populations and the methods of factor analysis and regression analysis, attempts to offer an intepretation of a new instrument using leadership and small group theory. The paper proposes that "initiating structure" and "consideration," terms from leadership theory, are valid means of interpretting teacher behavior, and that leadership is a more useful metaphor for teaching than Communication Style. The paper also shows that a measure of consideration is the best predictor of successful teaching.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association
Indianapolis, Indianna. April 1985.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert A. Cocetti

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 504 892

Rationale

Communication in Education . Communication has long been known to be an important part of the teaching process. In fact, in Kulik and McKeachie's (1975) review of research on teacher evaluation, they make the following statement:

> "The highly rated teacher is verbally fluent and strikes his peers as cultured and sophisticated. He is expressive and enthusiastic. Items describing such an effective communicator are prominent in the evaluative scales of every student rating form. Such items are so salient that evaluative scales, while usually labeled Competence, Skill, and so on, have been labeled Communications or Teacher's Presentation by some investigators. The good teacher is a good talker (emphasis added).
>
> "The prevailing forms in higher education today--lectures and discussion--demand verbally effective educators. The student role in these forms of education is largely that of audience. The verbally fluent educator who can hold an audience for an hour or two each day is naturally more effective than his less verbal colleagues"(p. 219).

Communicator Style . The question is, of course, what is a good communicator, and what is good communication? One of the striking things about Kulik and McKeachie's comments is that their conceptualization of communication is strictly verbal: it does not address the non-verbal aspects of communication at all. This is a prevailing bias in much of literature until very recently. A 1969 report of teaching behaviors among biology teachers reveals this bias. Evans (1969) says " these data are presented because they provide evidence that one cannot realistically observe a classroom session and conclude that there is not influential nonverbal

behavior" (p. 223). Keith, Tornatzky, and Pettigrew (1974) state that " there is little research which has examined the variety of verbal and non-verbal behaviors by teachers and learners as they spontaneously manifest and interact in the classroom " (p.31, italics in the original). Since then, of course, there has been a great deal of research in the nonverbal aspect of instructional communication. Smith's review of research, "Nonverbal Communication in Teaching," (1979) contains nearly 250 references, indicating a good deal of interest in the ten years between 1969 and 1979.

Methods of Research. Methods of research in instructional communication vary widely, depending upon the interests of the researcher and the aims of the research. The primary question is whether or not it is necessary to use first-hand observation or visual recording of teacher behavior to assess the impact of non-verbal communication. Evans (1969) and Keith (1974) both used videotape to investigate nonverbal behavior. Others, however, such as Kearney (1980) and Norton, have chosen more traditional paper-and-pencil tests from which to develop theories about the behavior of teachers. Following Kearney and Norton, two important researchers in the field of Instructional Communication, whose work will be summarized later, this paper develops a paper-and-pencil questionaire devoted to the measurement of communcation style.

Content and Relationship. One of the conceptual advances in communication research has been the distinction between the content and relationship aspect of communication. This distinction is originally attributed to Reusch and Bateson (1951) as report and command , but popularized by the influential book of Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson (1967) as content and relationship . Content refers to what is said, and relationship refers to how it is to be interpretted. Similarly, there is a distinction between the verbal and non-verbal aspects of communication.

Verbal refers to the words being uses (linguistics), and non-verbal refers to "everything" else (Littlejohn, 1983). However, the distinctions between the verbal/nonverbal apsects and the content/relationship aspects of communication are not clear, as Smith (1979) points out. He refers to the work of Harrison and Crouch and says that Harrison and Crouch "made a distinction between messages of relationship, of which many are passed nonverbally, and messages of content, of which a majority are probably verbal in nature" (p.639).

Thus, the primary assumption in this paper is that the relationship aspect of communication is delivered non-verbally. The question is whether or not the nonverbal or the relationship aspect of communication can be captured by a paper-and-pencil instrument, a method which facilitates the evaluation of teachers. The related issues are the reliability and validity of the instrument being used.

Communication Style. One of the important programs dealing with the question of communication style is under the direction of Robert Norton. Among his research is the Communication Style Measure which is reported in Communication Yearbook I. Norton (1977) defined Communicator Style as "the way one verbally and paraverbally interacts to signal how the literal meanings should be taken, interpreted, filtered or understood." (p.257). Norton's construct is defined by eleven independent variables and one dependent variable. The independent variables are dominant, dramatic, animated, open, contentious, relaxed, friendly, attentive, impression leaving, precise, and voice; the dependent measure is communicator image. Norton contends that these variables operationally define the relationship aspect of communication.

In summarizing his research Norton says "this research provides strong evidence that percieved effectiveness in teaching is inextricably related to one's style of communication. If this is true, the quality of teaching can be improved by improving behaviors relating to attentive, impression leaving,

relaxed, dominant, friendly, and precise style components" (p. 541).

Norton's research seems to be based upon the idea that there is an ideal communicator—i.e., the instrument is prescriptive. Norton's contentious subconstruct, for instance, is made up of following items, which will illustrate the prescriptive nature of his instrument (p.528):

—When this person disagrees with someone he/she is very quick to challenge him/her.

—This person is very argumentative.

—Once this person get wound up in a heated discussion he or she has a hard time stopping himself/herself.

—It bothers this person to drop an argument that is not resolved.

The instrument is prescriptive in the sense that there is a clear set of contrast classes involved in the questionaire. For instance, it is clearly wrong to quickly challenge; it is clearly wrong to be very argumentative; it is clearly wrong to continue a heated discussion; it is clearly wrong to not resolve an argument. "Wrong" here is used in the sense of the ideal communicator, the rhetorically sensitive individual, and that to the extent that we have an image of such a person, it is "right" to approach that ideal and "wrong" to stray from it.

While it is very difficult to argue conclusively that an instrument is prescriptive rather than descriptive, the wording of the contentious subconstruct seems to "prescribe" the right answer.

Teacher Communication Style. There is a second approach to the problem of communication style—that of Patricia Kearney, reported at, among other places, the 1980 Western States Speech Association Convention. The essential difference between the Kearney and the Norton approach is that—at least in it theoretical structure—Kearney's approach is descriptive rather than

prescriptive.

Kearney traces her construct to Norton's Communication Style and to a measure called Social Style, a concept popularized chiefly by Wilson Learning Corporation. Social Style, according to Larry Barker (1981), has been developed from the theories of Carl Jung, whose work is responsible for a number of similar constructs and instruments. One of Jung's key distinctions, for instance, is the difference between extroversion and introversion. There is no sense of prescription at all in the introversion-extroversion dimension; introversion and extroversion are both terms which are more descriptive than prescriptive.

This becomes a major emphasis in the programs and literature which discuss the Social Style approach to interpersonal relationships. Wilson Learning creates a set of axes in which the hortizontal axis represents assertiveness—low assertiveness on the left side and high assertiveness on the right side. Intersecting the horizontal axis is a vertical axis which represents responsiveness—low at the top and high at the bottom. The intersection of these two axes create four quadrants which represent four personality types (see attached diagram), and Wilson Learning's contention is that there is no one best Social Style. The key to successful interpersonal relationships is an understanding of each of the types of personalities and an understanding of the kinds of things that motivate or interest each type. The theoretical and practical implications of this are important. There is no ideal communicator: there are only different kinds of people who see things very differently. In terms of modern communication theory this is a very appealing position.

Kearney's questionaire is a 36-item instrument developed around the two dimensions of assertiveness and responsiveness, dimensions which form the basis of Social Style, and a third dimension called versatility, a dimension

which generally does not appear in Social Styles, but is deemed to be important in other interpersonal theories. Twelve items operationally define each of the three dimensions.

Kearney defined assertiveness as "perceptions of teacher control in the classroom" (emphasis added). Responsiveness is characterized by behavior which is "emotional, sensitive, social, understanding, and approachable." Versatile describes behavior which allows a teacher to adapt to student needs and characteristics. Kearney's position is that highly effective teachers are "assertive, responsive, and versatile in their communicative exchanges with their students (p.10)." In other words-- perhaps in Wilson Learning's words-- effective teachers are those characterized by one particular quadrant of the Social Styles, the bottom right quadrant or the "expressive." Kearney's TCS is also in this sense a prescriptive instrument: it defines an ideal just as much as Norton's instrument does. What it also seems to do is to defy the logic built into the Social Style instrument of Wilson Learning: there is a best style, particularly for a teacher.

Self-report vs. Peer-report. One of the arguments between Kearney and Norton concerned the question of a teacher's perception of his or her own behavior versus that of the perceptions of that teacher's students: are these perceptions similar or not? Norton is of the opinion that teachers and students see behaviors quite similarly, in which case a teacher's self-report is a perfectly acceptable instrument, indeed a preferred instrument. Kearney holds that they do not, in which case a peer report is required. Since student evaluations will always be an important part of the evaluation of teachers--and since students are the audience to which teaching is played--it is important to include the student's perception in the evaluation somewhere. This paper argues that it is important, a priori, to include student perceptions in the evaluation process somewhere, regardless of whether

they are similar to the teacher's perceptions or not.

A second reason for including the use of peer-reports rather than self-reports is that self-reports suffer from what Jum Nunnally (1967) calls the social-desirability factor, which is to say that people tend to fill out self-reports not on the basis of what they think they do, but on the basis of what is socially desirable. Norton does address this problem, but the problem becomes especially acute where there seems to be some tendency toward a prescriptive bent in an instrument to begin with.

Thus, the Kearney instrument was chosen as a basis for measuring Communication Style for three main reasons:

(1) The format of the instrument appears to be more descriptive than evaluative;

(2) Its theoretical foundations encourage the viewpoint that there is no one best communication style;

(3) It is designed as a peer report.

Method

Overview. Once Kearney's instrument was chosen, it was given to a group of 247 students at one university; the data from that sample were factor analyzed, and from the results of that factor analysis, a second instrument was developed consisting of nineteen items. That questionaire was then given to a group of 501 students enrolled in the basic communications course at another college. The data from that instrument were factor analyzed and a correlation was computed between the measure of Communication Style and a measure of Teaching Effectiveness (see questionaire attached). A stepwise regression analysis yielded a prediction equation based upon two of the variables. Next, a third application to a group of 223 students enrolled in the same general studies course the following semester were similarly analyzed. Finally, the instrument was revised by adding six items, reflecting an interpretation of the instrument in terms of small group leaderships theory. The final version of the instrument consists of twenty-five items comprising the set of predictor variables; this version was administered to 352 students and similar analyses were run.

In the final three applications reliability, Pearson's correlation, and a stepwise regression equation are reported for each version of the instrument.

The First Study. The initial effort in this program was a sample of 247 student enrolled in a number of communication courses at a midwestern university. There were nineteen sections in the first study and eleven instructors, all of whom were volunteers. The thirty-six item Kearney instrument was factor analyzed in several ways. The first analysis was an orthogonal rotation which did not specify any number of factors. This yielded a factor structure which included eight factors with an eigenvalue greater than one. The solution was uninteresting and uninterpretable. Following Kearney's suggestion that the factors were highly correlated, another factor

analysis was run, this time using an oblique rotation and asking for three factors, which is consistent with the instrument's theoretical structure. This resulted in the array listed in Table 1. The results of this study were reported by McGurkin and others (1983) at the Central States Speech Association convention.

The Second Study. Nineteen items from the original questionaire were selected for the second study on the basis of the factor loading from Table 1. The criteria for retaining an item were a minimun loading of .55 on the primary factor, with no greater loading than .40 on secondary factors. This resulted in a questionaire which was about half the size of the original, yet retained enough of the items to make it practically useful. The items were scored on a seven-point Likert scale.

The instrument was administered to all the students enrolled in the Basic Studies Communication Course at a midwestern college in the Fall of 1982. The questionaire was given as part of a department-sponsored program of evaluation. There were 501 students equally divided betweeen male and female and predominantly freshmen. The evaluation was required of all the instructors in the program. This represented 14 instructors, mostly part-time teachers and graduate assistants, evenly divided between male and female.

The instrument was divided into two parts, one of which represented a set of predictor variables, theoretically three in number called Teacher Communication Style, and a set of items which represented a criterion variable, labelled Teacher Effectiveness.

Four analyses were conducted on each succeeding version of the instrument: a factor analysis specifying oblique rotation with three factors; a Pearson correlation; a reliability estimate, using Cronbach's Alpha; and a stepwise regression equation. The results of the second application are reported in Table 2.

The factor structure shows that 17 of the 19 items on the instrument show up as primary loadings. Factor 1 is labelled as responsiveness, following the Kearney nomenclature. It is composed of a set of items which are basically interpersonal in nature. The two highest loadings are "open" and "approachable."

The second factor is one which was labelled Assertiveness and includes the first seven items on the instrument. The items with the two highest loadings are "is assertive" and "takes control."

The third factor is a negative factor in that it decribes a quality which students appear not to like: rigidity. The Kearney instrument labels this factor as flexibility, but the negative connotation of rigidity is more descriptive of the third factor, particularly in light of subsequent admissions of the instrument in which all of the other items tend to drop out.

When the sum of the first nineteen items, here called Teacher Communication Style, and the sum of six items comprising the criterion variable, called Teacher Effectiveness, are correlated, the result is a correlation of 0.74, which explains about 50 percent of the variance in the instrument.

The stepwise regression equation loads responsiveness first and assertiveness second. Rigidity does not appear in the regression equations.

Finally, the instrument shows an alpha reliability of 0.83.

The Third Study . The third study is essentially a replication of the second study, with the only changes being that the number of students dropped to 223, the number of instructors dropped to eight, and the scoring on the instrument was changed from a seven-point scale to a six-point scale. This reflects Nunnaly's (1967) concern for the middle ground on a scale—that is, the undecided. Nunnaly argues that a scale with an even number of points, rather than an odd number of points, forces respondents to pick one side of

the scale or the other. This tends to entail a "slight advantage" to instruments which use a scale with an even number, particularly considering the respondents who are undecided or unwilling (p.5 2). The results of this application of the instrument are displayed in Table 3.

There are several noteworthy changes in the factor structure of the instrument. First of all, "rigidity" shows up alone in factor 3. The three other items which originally comprised factor 3 now appear in factor 1, strengthening the interpretation of this factor as one of a more general interpersonal nature.

Two items have disappeared from factor 2—"shy" and "challenge"— and the nature of factor 2 suggests a definite task-related structure. It is with this administration of the instrument that the possibility of interpretting the instrument in terms of small group theory was suggested. Factor 1 appears to be "consideration" and factor 2 is "initiating structure" (Yukl, 1981). Factor 3 is defined only by rigidity.

Given that one possible interpretation of the instrument is in terms of consideration and structure, a number of studies using a similar rationale were consulted. Four additional items were chosen from that literature (Keane,1979), in addition to two items suggested by teachers who had been rated on the TCS. In videotaped interviews the teachers noted that "enthusiasm" (McLaughlin, 1980) and "sense of humor" were indispensible parts of a communication style and that neither was represented in the current version of the instrument. This interview pointed out that key items operationally defining the "expressive" were missing from the instrument, enthusiasm being a crucial one.

The four items representing descriptors in other instruments were (22) is persuasive; (23) is easy to understand; (24) is critical; (25) is skillful in arguing.

The Fourth Study. Table 4 shows the resulting statistical analyses from the latest admission of the instrument, now a 25-item instrument. Factor 3, rigidity, remains unchanged and defined only by the single item. Factor 2, assertiveness or structure, also remains little changed. Three items which consistently show up on Factor 2 remain: is aggressive, is in control, and is assertive.

Three of the six items which were added to the instrument appear in Factor 1, labelled responsiveness or consideration. "Enthusiasm, Humor, and Understanding" load on Factor 1. Two of the added items represent marginal loadings. "Is Persuasive" loads on Factor 1 at 0.46; "Is Critical" loads at 0.44 on Factor 3, while the sixth item, "Skillful in Arguing," is spread rather evenly over the three factors.

The correlation between the TCS and Teaching Effectiveness is a rather strong 0.84; the regression equation is very similar to previous studies, loading responsiveness first and a combination of responsiveness and assertiveness second. Rigidity does not appear in this regression equation either. Alpha reliability is 0.83.

Discussion.

The TCS has displayed a rather consistent factor structure, given three separate populations totalling nearly 1000 students. There are two possible interpretations of the instrument: one as a corroboration of Kearney's approach in which the combination of responsiveness and assertiveness predict teaching success; the other in terms of small group leadership theory, in which classroom teaching is seen simply as another variation of small group behavior, where consideration and structure are key elements. In either case there is the additional factor to consider. This is not the subconstruct of flexibility, as hypothesized by Kearney, but the negative of flexibility, which is rigidity, and which appears consistently in the factor structure but not in the regression analyses.

Another way to ask the question is whether or not it is more informative to interpret the instrument in terms of communication theory or in terms of small group leadership theory.

The answer to this turns on two considerations. First, does the instrument adequately operationalize Communication Style and second, what advcantages are there in interpretting classrooom behavior in terms of leadership theory.

The most telling arguement against the three-dimension instrument is that the most generous method off factoring the instrument--a three-factor oblique solution--failed to confirm the theoretical structure of the instrument. The factor structure displayed in Table 1 contained the fewest number of items theoretically belonging to factor 2 in factor 1. In other methods of factoring the instrument, item number 14, "is flexible," often loads in Factor 1, which is responsiveness. That alone arose suspicion as to the workability of responsiveness, assertiveness, and flexibility as adequate descriptors of Communication Style.

There is further evidence. The predominant factor in all of the analyses was responsiveness. Responsiveness is a factor composed of items such as "approachable," "open," "communicative," "shows feelings," and "adjusts well to others." These items not only indicate something about responsiveness, but they also seem descriptive of some more general interpersonal nature. They do have to do with the set of interpersonal relationships which develop within a classroom (Scott, 1981).

The second factor is defined by items such as "likes a challenge," "is aggressive," "is in control," "is assertive," and negative loadings such as "is shy," and "is hesitant." On the one hand this does describe assertive behavior; on the other hand it describes someone who is interested in the task at hand in the classroom--initiating structure.

Factor 3 is hypothesized as flexibility, yet item 9, "is flexible," rarely loads in factor 3. Half of the time "is flexible" loads under Factor 1, the general interpersonal factor. Also note that "is critical" represents a marginal loading (.46) on Factor 3. That may indicate the negative connotations of that word, being critical.

Thus, the composite picture described by this instrument is that a successful teacher is one who is high in responsiveness, general interpersonal skills, or consideration; secondly, it is one who is high in assertiveness or initiating structure. Finally, it is one who is not rigid, which is a somewhat ambiguous term. It seems to more than the opposite of flexibility, for it consistently appears as a separate factor, while "flexibility" as often as not is associated with items of a general interpersonal nature.

There are advantages to interpretting this line of research in terms of small group leadership theory. For one thing it taps an enormous literature, going back at least forty years. For another, leaderships provides an apt metaphor for teaching, in that teaching is like leading in a number of

respects. Both need to be concerned about the task at hand, whether it be teaching speech or designing innovative computers. Both need to be concerned about the nature of the feelings of the individuals involved as followers. Both need to be concerned about the difference between "selling and telling." Finally, leadership stresses the interaction between leader and follower, a concept not strongly stressed in Communication Style research.

Future research. If small group theory offers a more parsimonious interpretation of this instrument, or if leadership offers a more compelling metaphor for the teaching process, it, like most small group communication work, has not adequately addressed the nature of power. Goodall (1984) sees this as a major shortcoming of most organizational communication work, but power is being investigated by some researchers (McCroskey, 1983). This instrument should benefit from insights into the nature of power in the classroom and in other organizations.

Secondly, the nature of the criterion variable is of concern. The criterion variable here is called Teacher Effectiveness, but in reality it is a measure of student satisfaction. The viability of student satisfaction as an outcome variable need considering. Mishler (in press) has severely criticized the studies in the field of doctor-patient relationships for using patient satisfaction and patient compliance as outcome variables, the same concerns may be true in the classroom.

Finally, if leadership does provide a convenient metaphor for teaching, some effort should be made to determine points of similarity and points of dissimilarity. Clearly, there are a number of differences.

Figure 1
SOCIAL STYLES (AFTER BARKER)
CRITERIA FOR RECOGNITION

LOW-RESPONSIVE

Reserved, unresponsive
Poker faced
Actions cautious or careful
Wants facts and details
Eye contact infrequent while listening
Eyes harsh, severe or serious
Limited use of hands, clenched tightly, folded or pointed
Limited personal feelings, story telling or small talk
Preoccupied or vigilant

LOW-ASSERTIVE

Seldom uses voice to emphasize ideas
Expressions and posture quiet and submissive
Deliberate, studied or slow in speech
Indifferent handshake
Asks questions more often than makes statements
Vague, unclear about what is wanted
Tends to lean backwards

HIGH-ASSERTIVE

Emphasizes ideas by tone change
Expressions aggressive or dominant
Quick, clear or fast paced
Firm handshake
Makes statements more often than asks questions
Lets one know what is wanted
Tends to lean forward to make a point

HIGH-RESPONSIVE

Animated, uses facial expressions
Smiles, nods, frowns
Actions open or eager
Little effort to push for facts
Eye contact frequent while listening
Friendly gaze
Hands free, palms up, open
Friendly gestures
Shares personal feelings
Attentive, responsive, enjoys the relationship

Table 1
Three-Factor Oblique Rotation*
May 1981
n=247

Factor 1 Responsiveness		Factor 2 Rigidity		Factor 3 Assertiveness	
19. Versatile	50	13. Rigid	55	1.Shy	59
21. Formal	39	14. Flexible	77	2.Challenge	56
23. Unyielding	48	15. Accomodate	82	3. Aggressive	66
24. Reacts	62	16. Dislike Ch.	60	4. Reserved	46
25. Adjusts	59	17. Adaptable	75	5. Control	59
26. Guarded	46	18. Informal	39	7. Positive	50
27 Approachable	61	20. Uncompromising	40	8. Reluctant	50
28. Open	57			9. Make Dec.	39
29. Restrained	49			10. Assertive	78
30. Self-disci.	48			11. Take Char.	72
31. Accessible	53			12. Hesitant	64
32. Show Feel	58				
33. Communicat.	62				
34. Attainable	58				
35. Inhibited	54				
36. Subdued	50				

*Decimal points omitted

Table 2
Oblique Rotation*
December 1982
n=501

Factor 1 Responsiveness		Factor 2 Assertiveness		Factor 3 Rigidity	
14. Adjusts	55	1. Shy	-60	8. Rigid	-55
15. Approachable	77	2. Challenge	62	9. Flex.	72
16. Open	81	3. Aggressive	70	10. Accomo	66
17. Show Feel	69	4. Control	72	12. Adapt.	60
18. Communicat.	69	5. Assert	74		
19. Attainable	57	6. Take Char.	71		
		7. Hesitant	- 66		

*Decimal points omitted

Reliability

Alpha = 0.83

Pearson Correlation

	TCS
Teacher Effectiveness	0.74
p=0.0000	

Regression Equation--Stepwise

TE = 5.69 + 1.30 (Resp)
TE = 2.25 + 1.05 (Resp) + .58 (Assert)

F = 0.0000

Table 3
Oblique Rotation*
May 1983
n=223

Factor 1 Responsiveness		Factor 2 Assertiveness		Factor 3 Rigidity	
9. Flexible	76	3. Aggressive	65	8. Rigid	-56
10. Accomodate	68	4. Control	57		
12. Adaptable	82	5. Assertive	58		
13. Reacts	85	6. Take Charge	71		
14. Adjusts	86				
15. Approachable	83				
16. Open	78				
17. Show Feel	56				
18. Communicative	64				

*Decimal points omitted

Reliability

Alpha = 0.84

Pearson Correlation

	TCS
Teacher Effectiveness	0.61

p=0.0000

Regression Equation—Stepwise

TE = 9.4 + 1.30 (Resp)
TE = 2.25 + 1.05 (Resp) = .58 (Assert)

F= 0.0000

Table 4
Oblique Rotation*
December 1983
n=352

Factor 1 Responsiveness		Factor 2 Assertiveness		Factor 3 Rigidity	
9. Flexible	63	3. Aggressive	64	8. Rigid	-57
12. Adaptable	65	4. Control	56		
13. Reacts	67	5. Assert	79		
14. Adjusts	77				
15. Approach	76				
16. Open	78				
17. Shows Feel	57				
18. Communicative	66				
19. Attainable	59				
20. Enthusiastic	60				
21. Humor	58				
22. Understand	55				

*Decimal points omitted

Reliability

Alpha = 0.83

Pearson Correlation

	TCS
Teacher Effectiveness	0.82

p = 0.0000

Regression Equation--Stepwise

TE = 1.39 + 0.65 (Resp)
TE = -0.07 + .54 (Resp) + .46 (Assert)

F = 0.0000

PART 1 COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR

AS A COMMUNICATOR MY TEACHER

	Agree			?			Disagree
1. is shy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. enjoys a challenge	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. is aggressive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. is in control	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. is assertive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. likes to take charge	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. is hesitiant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. is rigid	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. is flexible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. is accomodating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. dislikes change	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. is adaptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. reacts to others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. adjusts well to others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. is approachable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. is open to others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. shows his/her feelings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. is communicative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. is attainable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. is enthusiastic*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. has a sense of humor*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. is persuasive*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. is easy to understand*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. is critical*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. is skillful in arguing*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

PART 2 COURSE CONTENT

26. Overall my instructor is among the best teachers I have known.

27. Overall, this course is among the best I have taken.

28. My instructor explains difficult material clearly.

29. My instructor motivates me to do my best work.

30. My instructor makes this course interesting and stimulating.

31. I would like to take another course from this instructor.

32. The amount of work was less than I had expected.

33. There is too much emphasis on public speaking.

34. I feel that I have acquired valuable communication skill through this course.

35. The quality of work produced was important.

36. Expected grade.

37. Teacher Code.

Teacher Effectiveness = 26 + 27 + 28 + 29 + 30 + 31 + 34

* Items added December 1983

Reverse scoring: items 1,7,8,11.

References

Archer, Dane and Robin M. Akert. "The Encoding of Meaning: A Test of Three Theories of Social Interaction." Sociological Inquiry 50 (1980), 393-419.

Barker, Larry L. Communication. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall. 1981.

Bateson, Gregory. Steps to an Ecology of Mind. (New York: Ballentine Books, 1972).

Benson, Thomas W. and Kenneth D. Frandsen. Nonverbal Communication. 2nd ed. Chicago: SRA Associates, 1982).

Bryant, Jennings, Jon S. Crane, Paul W. Comisky, Dolf Zilman. "Relationship Between College Teachers' Use of Humor and Students' Evaluation of Their Teachers." Journal of Educational Psychology. 72 (1980), 511-19.

Clark, Ruth Ann and Jesse Delia. " TOPOI and Rhetorical Competence. QJS 65 (1979). 187-206.

Evans, Thomas P. "A Category System for Teacher Behavior." The American Biology Teacher. 31(1969), 221-224.

Fisher, Aubrey B. Small Group Decision Making: Communication and the Group Process. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980).

Green, Paul C. and Diane D. Harrigan. Behavioral Interviewing. (San Diego: Univeristy Associates, 1982).

Hayes, Michael T. "Initial Classroom Contact: Critical Incident in Promoting Learning." Paper presented at the Mini-Convention on the Teaching-Learning Process, University of Nebraska at Omaha, 1980.

Keane, Frank K. and Linda Zaichkowsky. "Leader Behavior in the University Classroom." Journal of Classroom Interaction. 1979. 30-34.

Keith, L. Thomas, Louis G. Tornatzky, and L. Eudora Pettigrew. "An Analysis of Verbal and Nonverbal Classroom Teaching Behaviors." Journal of Experimental Education. 42 (1969), 30-38.

Kearney, Patricia. Perceptual Discrepancies in Teacher Communication Style. A paper presented at Western Speech Communiction Association, 1980.

Kulik, James A. and Wilbert J. McKeachie. "The Evaluation of Teachers in Higher Education." in Review of Research in Education, Vol. 3. ed. Fred N. Kerlinger. (Itasca, IL.: F.E. Peacock, 1975), 210-240.

Leathers, Dale G. Nonverbal Communication Systems. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1976).

McCroskey, James C. and Virginia P. Richmond. "Power in the Classroom I: Teacher and Student Perceptions." Communication Education. 32 (1983) ,175-181.

McGukin, Drew and others. An Examination of Issues Related to the Use of TEacher Communication Style as an Indicant of Teacher Effectiveness. Paper presented to the Central States Speech Assciation, 1983.

McLaughlin, Margaret L., Keith V. Erickson, and Margaret A. Ellison. "A Scale for the Measurement of Teachers' Affective Communication." Communication Education. 29 (1980), 21-32.

Mishler, Elliot. The Discourse of Medicine: Dialectics of the Medical Interview. (Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishers, (in press).

Norton, Robert W. "Teacher Effectiveness as a Function of Communicator Style." in Communication Yearbook I. ed. Brent Rubin. (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1977), 525-542.

Norton, Robert W. Communicator Style. (Beverly Hills: Sage Books, 1983).

Nunnally, Jum. Psychometric Theory. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967).

Pittenger, Robert E. The First Five Minutes. (Ithaca, N.Y.: Martineau, 1960).

Reusch, J and G. Bateson. The Social Matrix of Psychiatry. (New York: Norton, 1951).

Sacks, Harvery. The First Five Minutes. Ph.D. Dissertation. Univerisity of California, Berkeley, 1967.

Scott, Michael D. and Jon F. Nussbaum. "Student Perceptions of Instructor Communication Behaviors and Their Relationship to Student Evaluation." Communication Education. 30 (1981), 44-53.

Smith, Howard A. "Nonverbal Communication in Teaching," Review of Educational Research. 49 (1979), 631-672.

Watzlawick, Paul, Janet Beavin, and Don D. Jackson. Pragmatics of Human Communication. (New York: W.W. Norton Co., 1967).

Yukl, Gary A. Leadership in Organizations. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1981).

Zunin, Leonard and Natalie Zunin. Contact: The First Four Minutes. (Los Angeles: Nash Publishing. 1972).